NORCO COLLEGE

Institutional Effectiveness & Governance Council
Minutes for May 16, 2024
Time: 12:50 pm to 1:50 pm
Location: IT*111

Meeting Participants

Committee Members Present

Dr. Greg Aycock, Ms. Rosio Becerra, Ms. Caitlin Busso, Dr. Greg Ferrer, Dr. Tenisha James,
Dr. Nancy Quinones and Mr. John Thehumury

Committee Members Not Present

Dr. Mark Hartley, Ms. Ashlee Johnson, Ms. Ruth Leal, Mr. Dan Reade, Dr. Tim Russell, Mr. Alex Spencer,
Mr. John Thehumury and Ms. Leona Vassale

Guest(s)

Mr. Dilraj Grewal (ASNC Sub for Mr. John Thehumury)

Recorder

Desiree Wagner

1. Call to Order
- (Time 1:19 pm)

2. Action Items

2.1 Approval of Agenda
- **MSC (Dr. Greg Aycock / Ms. Caitlin Busso)**
- Approved by consensus, 0 Abstentions.

2.2 Approval of April 25, 2024, Meeting Minutes
- **MSC (Dr. Greg Aycock / Dr. Nancy Quinones)**
- Approved by consensus, 0 Abstentions.

2.3 IEGC Report of Effectiveness 2024
- **MSC (Ms. Caitlin Busso / Ms. Rosio Becerra)**
- Reviewed and discussed IEGC Report of Effectiveness and council discussed the findings.
- Feedback from the council members:
  - IEGC needs to be mindful and intentional in looking at our objectives. Ensuring they align. More importantly the need to assist in governance structure.
  - When IEGC goes to work on their charter next year we will need to look at our scope and deliverables to see what objectives we are not completing. From there we should assess if the objective needs to be removed from our charter.
- Approved by consensus, 0 Abstentions.

3. Discussion Item

3.1 [Marketing Committee Substantive Change Request](#)

- The committee reviewed the Substantive Change Request and provided the following feedback:
  - The charter list scopes and expected deliverables that conflict and overlap with classified employees job duties (NC Public Affairs Officer, Instructional Production Specialist, and Instructional Technology Specialist).
  - Recommend shifting the purpose and not someone's job description.
  - Recommend reaching out to the other colleges to mirror their charter.
  - Members questioned why the original recommendations weren't taken into consideration and reflected in the revised charter.
  - Members also questioned if the Marketing Committee is even needed. If so, then Why? (Why should be the purpose of the Marketing Committee.)
  - In the SPGM it lists the leadership councils can cancel the committee's charters, at what point do we as a leadership council move forward with canceling?
  - Members are concerned about the lack of Marking Committee members attendance at the past meetings to speak on the change request and questions the IEGC members have for the committee.
  - All members agreed to hold off on canceling the Marking Committee until a member from the committee can come and address the above questions and concerns.
- The committee has agreed to table this item until the next meeting.

3.2 [Institutional Effectiveness and Data Governance](#)

- Two related items we plan on presenting together.
  - 1. An overview of the Office of IE and our roles/responsibilities,
  - 2. Data Governance document outlining what it is, why we need it and a proposed process. Also, a sample version of a workgroup/subcommittee charter for Data Governance. The goal is to introduce this to the council so we can eventually agree on a process and an overseeing body in the Fall 2024.

4. Information Items

4.1 Strategic Planning IEGC Workgroup Update

5. Good of the Order

5.1 Reports of Effectiveness Reminder (NAC, PRC, FPDC, Marketing)

6. Future Agenda Topics

6.1 Marketing Committee Substantive Change Request

7. Adjournment

- Time 1:50 pm

IEGC Purpose

The Institutional Effectiveness & Governance Council (IEGC) coordinates, discusses, and makes recommendations regarding functions, plans, and activities related to mission, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, institutional integrity, leadership, and governance. The IEGC provides leadership and retains responsibility for ACCJC Standards I and IV, while serving as a communication link to the rest of the college regarding strategic and operational matters associated with their assigned Educational Master Plan objectives. The IEGC makes recommendations to the College Council, Academic Senate and the Vice President of Planning & Development.

Report of Effectiveness 2023-2024

Governance Entity:
Institutional Effectiveness & Governance Council

Charge:
The Institutional Effectiveness & Governance Council (IEGC) coordinates, discusses, and makes recommendations regarding functions, plans, and activities related to mission, academic quality, institutional effectiveness, institutional integrity, leadership, and governance. The IEGC provides leadership and retains responsibility for ACCJC Standards I and IV, while serving as a communication link to the rest of the college regarding strategic and operational matters associated with their assigned Educational Master Plan objectives. The IEGC makes recommendations to the College Council, Academic Senate, and the Vice President of Planning & Development.

Sponsoring Council/Senate:
College Council

Co-chairs:
Dr. Tenisha James, Ms. Ashlee Johnson and Ms. Leona Vassale (proxy)

Members:
Dr. Greg Aycock, Ms. Rosio Becerra, Ms. Caitlin Busso, Dr. Greg Ferrer, Dr. Mark Hartley, Dr. Tenisha James, Ms. Ashlee Johnson, Ms. Ruth Leal, Dr. Nancy Quinones, Mr. Dan Reade, Dr. Tim Russell, Mr. Alex Spencer, Mr. John Thehumury (ASNC), Ms. Leona Vassale and Ms. Dana White

Evaluation of the Survey of Effectiveness:

Results of the 2024 IEGC Survey of Effectiveness highlighted several areas of strength and opportunities for growth.

According to survey results, all (7) participants either strongly agreed or agreed that agendas and minutes were provided far enough in advance of meetings, members were encouraged to be actively involved, discussions were collegial, differing opinions were respected, and that members worked toward fulfilling the charge.

Additionally, the group also had strong agreement in several other areas in which all but one (1) of the seven (7) participants either strongly agreed or agreed that: agenda items were completed within the meeting time, members regularly communicated with their constituent groups regarding key issues discussed and actions taken during meetings, the charge was understood by members, the work of the Council

made an impact on its assigned EMP Goals or KPIs, and that the governance entity aligned well with the college mission.

Additionally, it is particularly interesting to note that many of the areas whose effectiveness was in most agreement above were also the areas whose effectiveness was in least agreement in 2023 which provides evidence for the council's growth in these areas.

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DOES NOT APPLY	TOTAL
Agenda and minutes are provided far enough in advance of meetings	71.43% 5	28.57% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
Agenda items are completed within the meeting time	28.57% 2	57.14% 4	14.29% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
Members are given adequate information to make informed recommendations or decisions	14.29% 1	57.14% 4	28.57% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
All members are encouraged to be actively involved	42.86% 3	57.14% 4	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
Discussions are collegial	57.14% 4	42.86% 3	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
Differing opinions are respected	28.57% 2	71.43% 5	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
Participation is meaningful and important to me	28.57% 2	42.86% 3	28.57% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
I regularly communicate with members of the constituent group I represent regarding key issues discussed and actions taken during meetings	57.14% 4	28.57% 2	14.29% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
The charge is understood by the members	0.00% 0	85.71% 6	14.29% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
Members work toward fulfilling the charge	0.00% 0	100.00% 7	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
The work of this governance entity has made an impact on its assigned EMP Goals or KPIs	14.29% 1	71.43% 5	14.29% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
The purpose of the governance entity aligns well with the college mission	28.57% 2	57.14% 4	14.29% 1	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7
Overall I am satisfied with this governance entity's performance	14.29% 1	57.14% 4	28.57% 2	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	7

SOE Open-Ended Question Responses:

"Utilizing the council to proactively monitor our governance and decision-making process, including amendments, the survey/reports of effectiveness, council structure, etc. There needs to be a calendar that requires the council to regularly review and update the SPGM and provide recommendations to strengthen our governance, evaluation, and decision-making processes. This council should also help facilitate a level of training and support for governance and the strategic plan."

"A clearer charge is to me the primary factor that limits IEGC's effectiveness. In particular it would be helpful if the charge had a sense of significance or importance or value. Past meetings have seemed to bog down in either uncertainty as to our goals or into occasionally confrontational discussions over small items that seem within our remit but aren't necessarily worth the amount of frustration they inspire. I will say that as a committee, I think our collegiality and sense of waiting to do useful things has improved as of late."

In the IEGC April 25, 2024, meeting in regard to the 2024 Survey of Effectiveness discussion, council members communicated the need to clarify IEGC's role in strategic planning and institutional effectiveness in greater collaboration with our subcommittees (FPDC, Program Review, NAC, etc.), as well as our role in reviewing, coordinating and making recommendations related to governance for the institution.

EMP Goal Alignment and Objective Alignment:

- Objective 4.1 - Increase percentage of employees who complete Guided Pathways training from 5% to 65% (305 out of 472 employees).
- Objective 4.2 - Increase percentage of employees who complete Racial Micro aggressions certificate from 1% to 60% (285 out of 472 employees).
- Objective 5.4 - Establish the Center for Workforce Innovation to create and expand apprenticeships & work-based learning opportunities.
- Objective 6.2 - Contribute to regional economic and workforce development by creating and expanding relationships with business and civic organizations.
- Objective 6.7 - Help establish a distinct regional identity, organization, and communication amongst our local communities.
- Objective 8.1 - Make program, student, and effectiveness (including assessment) data available, usable, and clear so critical data is visible in real time.
- Objective 8.2 - Develop integrated planning processes that include all planning, accreditation self-study, resource allocation, and alignment with district and statewide plans based on the college mission and plans.
- Objective 8.3 - Revise governance process - formalize all unwritten governance processes for more effective implementation of the Educational Master Plan.
- Objective 8.4 - Develop, evaluate, and monitor our governance, decision-making, and resource allocation processes based on the college mission and plans.
- Objective 9.2 - Develop systems and provide resources to preserve and foster a positive workplace culture for all constituent groups including full-time faculty, part-time faculty, classified professionals, student workers, and managers.
- Objective 9.4 - Develop strategy to maximize the number of classified, faculty and managers involved in college governance without compromising mission-critical work.
- Objective 10.13 - Develop and implement plans for off-campus facilities for instructional purposes.

Self-Report on EMP Objective Progress:

Objective	Progress
Objective 4.1	Unclear
Objective 4.2	Unclear
Objective 5.4	Unclear
Objective 6.2	Unclear
Objective 6.7	Unclear
Objective 8.1	In-Progress
Objective 8.2	In-Progress
Objective 8.3	In-Progress
Objective 8.4	In-Progress
Objective 9.2	Not Started
Objective 9.4	Not Started
Objective 10.13	Unclear

Progress made by IEGC and its Sub-Committees towards EMP Goals and Objectives indicated by: Complete, In-Progress, Not Started, Unclear

Self-Report on Appropriate Objective Assignment:

Objective	Appropriateness
Objective 4.1	Unclear
Objective 4.2	Unclear
Objective 5.4	Unclear
Objective 6.2	Unclear
Objective 6.7	Unclear
Objective 8.1	Appropriate
Objective 8.2	Appropriate
Objective 8.3	Appropriate
Objective 8.4	Appropriate
Objective 9.2	Appropriate
Objective 9.4	Appropriate
Objective 10.13	Unclear

Appropriateness of Objective Assignment with IEGC and its Sub-Committees is indicated by: Appropriate, Inappropriate, Unclear

Assessment of Scope and Deliverables:

1. Ensure the evaluation and review process of the college's mission, vision, core commitments, institution-set standards, brand; ensure alignment with strategic planning documents (e.g. Strategic Planning and Governance Manual) and Educational Master Plan	1. In-Progress
2. Coordinate the review and evaluation of both the assessment and the program review plans, templates, and process	2. In-Progress
3. Coordinate the development, review and evaluation of the Strategic Planning and Governance Manual, Student Equity Plan, marketing and communications plans. Evaluate and recommend updates/ amendments to the Strategic Planning & Governance Manual	3. In-Progress
4. Support advances to student communication systems/structures with an equity and guided pathways lens	4. Not Started
5. Support the use of data, research, and analysis to inform planning and the alignment of college strategic goals	5. In-Progress
6. Coordinate the review and evaluation of college planning structures, processes, and operations	6. In-Progress
7. Evaluate and communicate college performance related to student achievement; and recommend actions toward improvement	7. In-Progress
8. Establish and maintain a document control system that includes a repository, establishes responsibilities, and ensures accurate organizing, routing, and tracking of documents	8. In-Progress
9. In mid-spring of each academic year, the Institutional Effectiveness & Governance Council will participate separately in dialogue sessions to 1) self-evaluate the effectiveness of its planning and decision-making processes through the Survey of Effectiveness, 2) self-report on Educational Master Plan objective progress and appropriate objective assignments, and 3) self-assess the completion of its charter's scope/deliverables during the academic year.	9. In-Progress
10. In late spring, the Institutional Effectiveness & Governance Council will receive an executive summary from each standing committee addressing the above three areas for review and discussion at a designated IEGC meeting. The receiving council (College Council) will make recommendations to, and receive recommendations from, the	10. Not Started

IEGC based on the results of the self-evaluation to determine if a charter needs to be revised/extended or not. 11. The Institutional Effectiveness & Governance Council will conduct its evaluation of effectiveness and post an executive summary on the Council's website.	 11. In-Progress

NORCO COLLEGE

Rationale Charter for Marketing Committee
Spring 2024

- The re-alignment of the Marketing Committee to the Resources Council is linear to the recent NC college re-organization/revised mission of the office of Planning & Development.
- Re-aligning the Marketing Committee to the Resources Council is linear to the District Marketing & Communication Committee structure.
- Re-aligning the Marketing Committee to the Resources Council is linear to the Strategic Planning structure of our sister colleges.

NORCO COLLEGE DATA GOVERNANCE

WHAT IS DATA GOVERNANCE

Data Governance is an emerging discipline that combines data management, data quality, and data policies. Data governance encompasses the processes, policies, standards, organization, and technologies required to manage and ensure the availability, accessibility, quality, consistency, auditability, and security of institutional data.

MISSION AND VISION

Mission: To ensure that the highest quality data are collected, analyzed and made available to key stakeholders through coordinated efforts for the purposes of improving efficiency, protecting privacy and enabling better decision-making.

Vision: The institution, along with IR and IE, benefits from using governance to define and implement a robust system that meets existing and long-term needs of both internal and external stakeholders. Key aspects of a strong system:

1. Data Management – identify essential data elements to be used in local, state and federal reporting requirements; define and standardize those elements for reliable and valid use across the institution and in multiple reports; and design and deploy effective and efficient collection and storage processes that ensure security, privacy and appropriate integration across programs and from multiple data sources.

2. Valid and Reliable Analyses – Provide controlled access and use, particularly by IR and IE staff, that enables timely, reliable and valid research and analysis.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to describe:

- who can take what actions,
- with what information,
- at what time,
- under what circumstances,
- using what methods

THE WHY

Typical situations when data governance is necessary:

- perceived problems with access to data,
- an inefficient process for requesting information,
- lack of data quality audits,
- duplication of data,
- insufficient training and education about data and the use of shadow systems,
- differences in terminology between units,
- competing priorities rather than complementary ones

Data Governance questions:

- What types of data are collected at the institution?
- Who is responsible for the quality of that data?
- How and where are the data stored and accessed?
- How are the data used and by whom?
- Who makes decisions about data collection?
- What do you do when errors are detected?
- Are the processes for ensuring the security of data documented?
- Is there a data dictionary to explain the meaning of common terms and where is it stored?

PRINCIPLES

- Integrity: Be truthful and forthcoming when discussing purposes, constraints, options, and impacts for data-related decisions.
- Accuracy: To the greatest extent reasonably practicable, data will be verified as accurate for the purposes of use.
- Transparency/Auditability: Exhibit transparency so that it is clear to all participants and auditors how and when data-related decisions and controls were introduced into data-related processes. Create and maintain auditable data-related decisions, processes, and controls subject to Data Governance; where any such process will be accompanied by documentation to support compliance-based and operational auditing requirements.
- Accountability: Define and clarify who is accountable for data-related decisions, processes, and controls.
- Responsibility: Define and clarify who is accountable for data accuracy.
- Standardization: Introduce and support standardization of all data and sources.
- Change Management: Support proactive and reactive Change Management activities for reference data values and the structure/use of master data and metadata.

GOALS

- Support processes and activities that result in accurate and reliable data.
- Provide a central location for various data resources: definitions, templates, processes.
- Data shall be appropriately managed (i.e., collected, stored, protected, and used).
- Data management shall be a core capability that is an integral part of the culture.

- Named roles with specific responsibilities for the curation of data from data entry to archive or disposal should be defined, trained, and appropriately resourced.
- The single, master source/office/role for each different type of data shall be identified and data systems and integrations structured to rely on that source.
- Data is fit for purpose.
- Data shall be accurate and complete, at the appropriate quality for its primary purpose and all other known legitimate uses.
- Data should be monitored so it can be trusted. Data owners have the role of accountability and oversight to assure this trust, with decisions and actions recorded at an appropriate level of detail.
- Data shall be made available where and when required, subject to appropriate security constraints.
- Standards will be consistently applied to encourage reuse, and promote a common understanding of context, meaning, and comparability.
- Data shall be easy to find, quick to understand, and simple to compare.
- Data shall be consistent and predictable, avoiding harm caused by conflicting versions.

RESPONSIBLE STAKEHOLDERS

- Office of Institutional Effectiveness
  - Data Sources
    - CCCCO MIS data files
  - Data & Research Projects
    - Historical data requests
  - Current and/or live data projects (Application Support Technician)
    - Colleague Student Information System
    - CCCApply
- Individual program staff
  - Data Sources
    - Local student databases (shadow databases)
      - Contact information
      - Program specific contact tracking, case management
      - Demographics
      - Enrollments
      - Program specific outcome information

CHALLENGES

- Multiple definitions of "student"
- Differing definitions of home college and enrolled college
- Definitions and methodology not readily available
- Data stored in varying places (local programs)

- Lack of understanding of Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and data security
- Differences between historical and live data
- Local vs. state data alignment
- Reliance on historical knowledge for methodology and definitions

PROCEDURES

Data Security
- Anyone with access to a data source will ensure data security by:
  - Creating a password/data encryption and thereby securing all files including Personally Identifiable Information (PII) protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).
    - For the purposes of data governance, Personally Identifiable Information (PII) is defined as an individual's first name, or first initial, and last name in combination with any one Direct Identifier or any combination of Direct/Indirect Identifiers that permits a person's identity to be reasonably inferred by someone who does not have personal knowledge of the relevant circumstances.
      - Direct Identifiers: Information that relates specifically to an individual, such as: name, social security number, student or employee id, driver's license number, address, telephone number, username or e-mail address, account number, credit card number, and biometric record (e.g., fingerprints).
      - Indirect Identifiers: Information that is not unique to an individual but that can be combined with other information to identify specific individuals, such as date of birth, place of birth, mother's maiden name, gender, race/ethnicity, geographic indicator, verification data (pet's name, etc.), and passwords.
  - Not sending unsecured data via email (Sharing via OneDrive is acceptable.)
  - Masking any data in a visualization (e.g. dashboard, presentation, etc.) that could potentially reveal the identity of an individual by an observer that does not have personal knowledge beyond that of a typical person.
  - Locking screen prior to leaving computer if data files are visible or accessible.

Data Results Circulation
- In addition to applicable data security measures mentioned above, anyone sharing data results via email, presentation, dashboard, etc. will need to follow these procedures:
  - Cite source(s) of results/analytics.
  - Have methodology of analysis available for those who ask related questions.
  - Do NOT assume data are correct without double- or triple-checking for accuracy.
  - If errors are found after data results are revealed, correct them as soon as possible and notify audience of correction.

Office of
Institutional
Effectiveness
NORCO COLLEGE

Data Validation
- Missing data – if any data element is missing enough values, it could invalidate the analysis. A guide to follow for missing data is:
    - Less than 1%: Excellent
    - 1%-5%: Good
    - 6%-9%: Marginal
    - 10%+: Unacceptable
- Check total number of cases to verify if it aligns with expectations. If not:
    - Check outside databases (if available)
    - Check internal databases (Colleague, local/program-specific databases, etc.)
- To verify data accuracy
    - If related to students, verify data with random sample of students in Colleague
    - If manually input from original data, triple-check (possibly with another person) values to identify input errors
    - Check Operational Definitions/Data Dictionary (hyperlink) for accuracy in methodology (e.g. course success/retention, valid grades, ethnicity categories, etc.)

Surveys
- Surveys requiring oversight from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness:
    - Any survey sent out to the entire student population or a large proportion of students
    - When survey conclusions/take-aways will impact college decision-making
- Surveys without required oversight (Office of IE is available for any guidance or feedback):
    - Surveys for specific populations
        - Example: soliciting feedback about an event with limited attendance
    - Surveys with conclusions/take-aways that will not impact the institution or budget

Dashboards
- Creating dashboards correctly requires extensive time and effort, plus expertise. Therefore, requests for dashboards should only be made when:
    - Requests for these data will be made repetitively (i.e., at least weekly) and ongoing.
    - Data are germane to achievement of the Educational Master Plan goals, Strategic Planning Goals, or effective performance of a college unit(s).

DATA GOVERNANCE PROCESS

Units and/or services who create or maintain a data source will need to undergo the Data Governance Process at Norco College when:

- The data source will be consistently utilized over time.
- Results of data will be shared beyond the unit that gathered the data.
- Student or employee contact is involved in the data gathering process.

Process
- Unit of data source will file an application (need to create).

- The Institutional Effectiveness and Governance Council (IEGC) will/has established a Data Governance Subcommittee who will review applications and vote on whether to ratify the establishment of a new and/or existing data source.

CHARTER FOR DATA GOVERNANCE IEGC WORKGROUP

This Charter is established between the Data Governance IEGC Workgroup and the Institutional Effectiveness and Governance Council to establish and implement a procedure for Data Governance at Norco College.

Purpose
The Data Governance IEGC Workgroup is comprised of constituency members from the IEGC and appointed members from CSEA and Academic Senate, including representation from administration, classified professional leads, and faculty leads. The workgroup is responsible for implementing data governance at Norco College.

Charge
The Data Governance IEGC Workgroup is charged with implementing a data governance process. The Workgroup is responsible for identifying the criteria/situations that will require data governance approval,

Guiding Principles and Assumptions
The IEGC Workgroup has established the following goals and principles for Data Governance: • Integrity: Be truthful and forthcoming when discussing purposes, constraints, options, and impacts for data-related decisions.   • Accuracy: To the greatest extent reasonably practicable, data will be verified as accurate for the purposes of use.   • Transparency/Auditability: Exhibit transparency so that it is clear to all participants and auditors how and when data-related decisions and controls were introduced into data-related processes. Create and maintain auditable data-related decisions, processes, and controls subject to Data Governance; where any such process will be accompanied by documentation to support compliance-based and operational auditing requirements.   • Accountability: Define and clarify who is accountable for data-related decisions, processes, and controls.   • Responsibility: Define and clarify who is accountable for data accuracy.   • Standardization: Introduce and support standardization of all data and sources.   • Change Management: Support proactive and reactive Change Management activities for reference data values and the structure/use of master data and metadata.

7

Scope & Expected Deliverables

The IEGC Workgroup will create and implement a data governance procedure, including criteria for submission, an application, and a process for approval. The Workgroup will also identify the future body/group that will continue the process long term.

Membership

The Workgroup consists of key members from the Institutional Effectiveness and Governance Council, appointed members from respective representative bodies, or defined membership based on expertise, title, functional area of responsibility (i.e. accreditation). The workgroup reports to the IEGC, and thus all updates and action items will be communicated to the oversight body, IEGC, College Council, and Academic Senate. Membership includes the following individuals:

Meeting Time/Pattern

The Data Governance IEGC Workgroup will meet monthly on

Roles of Chairs and Members

The Chair/Co-Chairs will communicate with IEGC to ensure continuity of dialogue between governance tiers, and as appropriate to College Council and Academic Senate. Chair/Co-Chairs are responsible for preparing agenda and facilitating meetings of the Workgroup based on best practices and guidelines for effective facilitation.
Members are recognized as stakeholders with important expertise and perspectives relevant to the . Members are expected to actively attend and participate in all meetings, deliberations, and decision-making processes. While representing the perspectives of the constituency group to which they belong members are expected to engage in effective dialogue with constituency peers with the intention of finding consensus on issues that come before the IEGC Workgroup.

Meeting Procedures and Expectations

The Chair(s), and members of this governance entity will adhere to meeting and governance best practices as follows given the operational tasks of the workgroup:

- Summary Notes will be provided in a timely manner to all members.
- Future meeting topics will be communicated in advance of all meetings.
- All members will have access to shared documents/folder.

Members endeavor to:

appropriately prepare for meetings based on the meeting agenda.
arrive promptly and stay for the duration of entire meetings.

Office of
Institutional
Effectiveness
NORCO COLLEGE

Meeting Procedures and Expectations
participate in a problem-solving approach where the interests of all participants are considered in developing proposals and recommendations and, where appropriate, distinguish between constituency versus college-wide perspectives. welcome all ideas, interests and objectives that are within the scope of the charter. actively listen to engage in respectful and constructive dialogue. work with a spirit of cooperation and compromise leading to authentic collaboration. move forward once a consensus-based decision has been made. follow through on tasks that are committed to outside of scheduled meetings.